REMARKS

Claim 1-31 are pending. The Office Action dated December 24, 2003 in this Application has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application into allowance. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 22, and 27 have been amended in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim 8 has been modified by an amendment. Applicants contend that the rationale underlying this amendment bears no more than a tangential relation to any equivalence in question because "and" has been added to line 4 and "; and" has been replaced with ".". *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 122 S.Ct. 1831 (2002).

Claims 1, 3, and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by U.S. Patent No. 6,363,242 by Brown, Jr. et al. ("Brown") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,614,772 by Sexton et al. ("Sexton") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,887,252 by Noneman ("Noneman"). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Regarding Claim 1, Brown was recited as assertedly fully disclosing the following: (1) generating a data burst comprising: a service reference identifier; a service option omit field indicating whether a service option identifier is to be included or omitted from the short data; and a data block; and (2) transmitting the data burst. Sexton was recited as assertedly fully disclosing the following: (1) short data burst (SDB). Noneman was recited as assertedly fully disclosing the following: (1) generating a data burst comprising: a service option omit field indicating whether a service option identifier is to be included or omitted from the short data. The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to combine teaches of Brown, Sexton, and Noneman in order to maximize system performance.

Rejected independent Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, "generating an SDB comprising:...*a reserve field that is at least reserved for future use, wherein the reserve field is less than five bits long*." (Emphasis added.) Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, page 5, lines 6-8 of the original Application.

Neither Brown, Sexton, nor Noneman not suggest, teach, or disclose a shortened reserve field. Specifically, Brown, Sexton, nor Noneman suggests, teaches, or discloses the use of a reserve field. However, the use of reserve field in short data burst wireless communications are well known in the art. Typically, the standard reserve field for short data bursts is five bits long. By reducing the length of the reserve field, the amount of data that needs to be communicated is reduced. Hence, the overall bandwidth required to transmit the data wirelessly is reduced, improving overall system performance.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 1 clearly and precisely distinguishes over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 3 and 4 depends on and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 3 and 4 also be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,634 by Boulos et al. ("Boulos"). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 depends on and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 2, 5, and 6 also be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman. Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Applicants contend that the rejection of amended Claim 7 is overcome for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. These reasons include neither Brown, Sexton, nor Noneman disclosing, teaching, or suggesting "appending to the SDB a reserve field that is at least reserved for future use, wherein the reserve field is less than five bits long." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 7 clearly and precisely is distinguishable over the cited references in any combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 7. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 7 clearly and precisely distinguishes over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman be withdrawn and that Claim 7 be allowed.

Claim 8, 10, and 11 depends on and further limits Claim 7. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 8, 10, and 11 also be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of Boulos. Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Claims 9, 12, and 13 depends on and further limits Claim 7. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 9, 12, and 13 also be withdrawn.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of Boulos. Insofar as it may be applied against the Claim, this rejection is overcome.

Applicants contend that the rejection of amended Claim 14 is overcome for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. These reasons include neither Brown, Sexton, Noneman, nor Boulos disclosing, teaching, or suggesting "a reserve field that is at least reserved for future use, wherein the reserve field is less than five bits long." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 14 clearly and precisely is distinguishable over the cited references in any combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 14. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 14 clearly and precisely distinguishes over the cited reference in a patentable sense,

and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of Boulos be withdrawn and that Claim 14 be allowed.

Claims 15-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of Boulos. Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Applicants contend that the rejection of amended Claim 15 is overcome for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. These reasons include neither Brown, Sexton, Noneman, nor Boulos disclosing, teaching, or suggesting "computer program code for appending to the SDB a reserve field that is at least reserved for future use, wherein the reserve field is less than five bits long." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 15 clearly and precisely is distinguishable over the cited references in any combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 15. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 15 clearly and precisely distinguishes over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of Boulos be withdrawn and that Claim 15 be allowed.

Claim 16-21 depends on and further limits Claim 15. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 16-21 also be withdrawn.

Claims 22-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of Boulos. Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Applicants contend that the rejection of amended Claim 22 is overcome for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. These reasons include neither Brown, Sexton, Noneman, nor Boulos disclosing, teaching, or suggesting "a reserve field that is at least reserved for future use, wherein the reserve field is less than five bits long." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 22 clearly and precisely is distinguishable over the cited references in any combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 22 Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 22 clearly and precisely distinguishes over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of Boulos be withdrawn and that Claim 22 be allowed.

Claims 23-26 depends on and further limits Claim 22. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 23-26 also be withdrawn.

Claims 27-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of Boulos. Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Applicants contend that the rejection of amended Claim 27 is overcome for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. These reasons include neither Brown, Sexton, Noneman, nor Boulos disclosing, teaching, or suggesting "a reserve field that is at least reserved for future use, wherein the reserve field is less than five bits long." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 27 clearly and precisely is distinguishable over the cited references in any combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 27. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 27 clearly and precisely distinguishes over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Brown in view of Sexton further in view of Noneman further in view of Boulos be withdrawn and that Claim 27 be allowed.

Claims 28-31 depend on and further limit Claim 27. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 28-31 also be withdrawn.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-29.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: 3/19/04

CARR LLP
670 Founder's Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003

Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093